

□ 0027

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT ON EXPANDED THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 263)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Enclosed is a report to the Congress on the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative, as required by section 1309 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 27, 2000.

**REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598**

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor to the bill H.R. 1598, the Patent Fairness Act of 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO INSERT COMMUNICATIONS IN THE RECORD**

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) be permitted to insert Committee on the Budget communications into the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 218 of H. Con. Res. 290, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD adjustments to the 302(a) allocation for the House Committee on Agriculture, set

forth in H. Rept. 106-577, to reflect \$5.5 billion in additional new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000 and \$1.640 billion in new budget authority and outlays for both fiscal year 2000 and \$1.640 billion in new budget authority and outlays for both fiscal year 2001 and for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Section 218 of H. Con. Res. 290 authorizes the Chairman of the House Budget Committee to increase the 302(a) allocation of the Committee on Agriculture for a conference report on a bill that provides assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops. Under the terms of section 218, the adjustments is in the amount of budget authority provided by that bill for the specified purpose but may not exceed \$5.5 billion in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000 and \$1.640 billion in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001.

This adjustment is for the conference report accompanying H.R. 2559 (H. Rept. 106-300).

If you have any questions, please contact Jim Bates of my staff at 6-7270.

**STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2000 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2000 THROUGH FY 2004**

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2000 and for the 5-year period of fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of June 15, 2000.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 290. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2000.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 290 for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal years 2000 through 2004. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also

needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2000 with the revised "section 302(a)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that, if at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to provisions of section 251(b)), there shall be a sequestration of funds within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. Determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

**REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 290**

(Reflecting action completed as of June 15, 2000—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2000	Fiscal year 2000–2004
Appropriate level (as amended):		
Budget authority .....	1,471,750	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,453,390	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	1,465,500	7,768,100
Current level:		
Budget authority .....	1,465,562	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,44,558	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	1,465,492	7,871,246
Current level over (+)/under (–) appropriate level:		
Budget authority .....	–6,188	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	–8,832	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	–8	103,146

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Year 2001 through 2004 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

**BUDGET AUTHORITY**

Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 2000 of more than \$6,188,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2000 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 290.

**OUTLAYS**

Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 2000 of more than \$8,832,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2000 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 290.

**REVENUES**

Enactment of any measure resulting in any revenue loss for FY 2000 through 2004 in excess of \$103,146,000,000 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 290.

June 27, 2000

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

12633

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 15, 2000

[Fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	2000		2000–2004	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
House Committee:				
Agriculture:				
Allocation .....	5,500	5,500	13,489	12,533
Current level .....	5,500	5,500	13,485	12,559
Difference .....			(4)	26
Armed Services:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation .....				(968)
Current level .....				
Difference .....				968
Commerce:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....			10	10
Difference .....			10	10
Education & the Workforce:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Government Reform & Oversight:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
House Administration:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
International Relations:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Judiciary:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....			(456)	(410)
Difference .....			(456)	(410)
Resources:				
Allocation .....			121	6
Current level .....	7	3	13	13
Difference .....	7	3	(108)	7
Science:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Select Committee on Intelligence:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Small Business:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Transportation & Infrastructure:				
Allocation .....				
Current level .....				
Difference .....				
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation .....			4,666	4,492
Current level .....				
Difference .....			(4,666)	(4,492)
Ways and Means:				
Allocation .....	(50)		3,012	3,064
Current level .....	53	52	21	20
Difference .....	103	52	(2,991)	(3,044)
Total authorized:				
Allocation .....	5,450	5,500	21,288	19,127
Current level .....	5,560	5,555	13,073	12,192
Difference .....	110	55	(8,215)	(6,935)

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) suballocations last updated on October 12, 1999 <sup>1</sup>		Current level reflecting action completed as of June 15, 2000		Difference	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	13,882	14,346	14,614	14,830	732	484
Commerce, Justice, State .....	35,774	34,907	38,095	38,356	2,321	3,449
National Defense .....	267,692	259,130	268,605	261,933	913	2,803
District of Columbia .....	453	448	430	501	(23)	53
Energy & Water Development .....	20,190	20,140	21,094	21,275	904	1,135
Foreign Operations .....	12,625	13,168	15,306	13,527	2,681	359
Interior .....	13,888	14,354	14,769	14,833	881	479
Labor, HHS & Education .....	75,763	77,063	86,451	86,345	10,688	9,282
Legislative Branch .....	2,478	2,484	2,449	2,448	(29)	(36)
Military Construction .....	8,374	8,775	8,352	8,595	(22)	(180)
Transportation <sup>2</sup> .....	12,400	43,445	12,493	43,502	93	57
Treasury-Postal Service .....	13,706	14,115	13,761	14,231	55	116
VA–HUD–Independent Agencies .....	68,633	82,045	72,104	83,445	3,471	1,400
Reserve/Offsets .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unassigned <sup>3</sup> .....	22,719	14,326	0	(768)	(22,719)	(15,094)
Grand total .....	568,577	598,746	568,523	603,053	(54)	4,307

<sup>1</sup> The Appropriations Committee did not revise the fiscal year 2000 302(b) suballocations after the passage of H. Con. Res. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Transportation does not include mass transit BA.

<sup>3</sup> Unassigned refers to the allocation adjustments provided under Section 314, but not yet allocated under Section 302(b).

## COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SEC. 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

(In millions of dollars)

	Defense <sup>1</sup>		Nondefense <sup>1</sup>		General purpose		Violent Crime Trust Fund		Highway category		Mass transit category	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Statutory Caps <sup>2</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	566,472	564,913	4,500	6,344	NA	24,574	NA	4,117
Current Level <sup>3</sup>	289,327	283,543	274,110	283,549	564,037	567,092	4,486	6,999	0	24,393	NA	4,569
Difference (Current level-caps)	NA	NA	NA	NA	-2,435	2,179	-14	655	NA	-181	NA	452

<sup>1</sup> Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.<sup>2</sup> Established by OMB Budget Enforcement Act Preview Report.<sup>3</sup> Consistent with H. Con. Res. 290.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, June 19, 2000.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of  
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2000 budget and is current through June 15, 2000. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, which replace H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000.

Since the beginning of the second session of the 106th Congress, in addition to the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues from adopting H. Con. Res. 290, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed an act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (P.L. 106-171), the Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176), the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181), the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-185), and the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200). In addition, the Congress cleared for the President's signature the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559).

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE  
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director.)

Enclosure.

## FISCAL YEAR 2000 HOUSE CURRENT STATUS REPORT AS OF JUNE 15, 2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues .....	0	0	1,465,500
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	876,422	836,631	0
Appropriation legislation .....	869,318	889,756	0
Offsetting receipts .....	-284,184	-284,184	0
Total, enacted in previous sessions .....	1,461,556	1,442,203	1,465,500
Enacted this session:			
Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176) .....	7	3	0
Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment & Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181) .....	2,805	0	0
Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200) .....	53	52	-8
Total, enacted this session	2,865	55	-8

## FISCAL YEAR 2000 HOUSE CURRENT STATUS REPORT AS OF JUNE 15, 2000—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Cleared pending signature:			
Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559) .....	5,500	5,500	0
Total current level <sup>1</sup> .....	1,465,562	1,444,558	1,465,492
Total budget resolution .....	1,471,750	1,453,390	1,465,500
Current level over budget resolution .....	0	0	0
Current level under budget resolution .....	-6,188	-8,832	-8
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2000-2004:			
House current level .....	0	0	7,871,246
House budget resolution .....	0	0	7,768,100
Current level over budget resolution .....	0	0	103,146

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include budget authority or outlays for Social Security administrative expenses. As a result, current level excludes these items. In addition, for comparability purposes, current level budget authority excludes \$1,159 million that was appropriated for mass transit.

Note.—P.L.—Public Law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

## STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2001 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2001 THROUGH FY 2005

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 202 and 203 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 290, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2001 and for the 5-year period of fiscal years 2001 through fiscal year 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of June 15, 2000.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, revenues, the surplus and advance appropriations with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 290. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act and sections 202 and 203(b) of H. Con. Res. 290, which create points of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2001 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 290 for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal years 2001 through 2005. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2001 with the revised "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that, if at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), there shall be a sequestration of amounts within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. The determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

## REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 290

(Reflecting action completed as of June 15, 2000—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2001	Fiscal year 2001-2005
Appropriate Level (as amended):		
Budget Authority .....	1,529,886	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,495,196	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	1,503,200	8,022,400
Surplus .....	8,004	( <sup>1</sup> )
Advance Appropriations .....	23,500	( <sup>1</sup> )
Current Level:		
Budget Authority .....	952,967	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,149,381	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	1,514,241	8,169,171
Surplus .....	364,860	( <sup>1</sup> )
Advance Appropriations .....	0	( <sup>1</sup> )
Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	-576,919	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	-345,815	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	11,041	146,771
Surplus .....	356,856	( <sup>1</sup> )

June 27, 2000

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

12635

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 290—Continued

[Reflecting action completed as of June 15, 2000—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001	Fiscal year 2001–2005
Advance Appropriations .....	–23,500	( <sup>1</sup> )

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 2002 through 2005 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 2001 (if not already included in the current level estimate) in excess of \$576,919,000,000 would cause FY 2001

budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 290.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 2001 in excess of \$345,815,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2001 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 290.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss for FY 2001 in excess of \$11,041,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 290.

Enactment of any measure resulting in any revenue loss for FY 2001 through 2005 in excess of \$146,771,000,000 (if not already in-

cluded in the current level) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 290.

SURPLUS

Enactment of any measure that reduces the surplus for FY 2001 by more than \$356,856,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2001 surplus to fall below the appropriate level set by Section 2092 of H. Con. Res. 290.

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

Enactment of any measure that would result in FY 2001 advance appropriations in excess of \$23,500,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause the FY 2001 advance appropriations to exceed the appropriate level set by Section 203(b) of H. Con. Res. 290.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(a), REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 15, 2000

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2001		2001–2005	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
House Committee:				
Agriculture:				
Allocation .....	3,062	2,295	9,837	8,824
Current Level .....	3,061	2,166	9,787	8,833
Difference .....	(1)	(129)	(50)	9
Armed Services:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation .....		(107)		(1,329)
Current Level .....				
Difference .....		107		1,329
Commerce:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....			15	15
Difference .....			15	15
Education & the Workforce:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Government Reform & Oversight:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
House Administration:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
International Relations:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Judiciary:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....	(114)	(75)	(570)	(524)
Difference .....	(114)	(75)	(570)	(524)
Resources:				
Allocation .....			162	44
Current Level .....	8	6	6	10
Difference .....	8	6	(156)	(34)
Science:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Select Committee on Intelligence:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Small Business:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Transportation & Infrastructure:				
Allocation .....				
Current Level .....				
Difference .....				
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation .....	510	479	7,280	7,037
Current Level .....				
Difference .....	(510)	(479)	(7,280)	(7,037)
Ways and Means:				
Allocation .....	55	25	3,035	3,038
Current Level .....	(47)	(47)	(29)	(28)
Difference .....	(102)	(72)	(3,064)	(3,066)
Total Authorized:				
Allocation .....	3,627	2,692	20,314	17,614
Current Level .....	2,908	2,050	9,209	8,306
Difference .....	(719)	(642)	(11,105)	(9,308)

## DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(b)

(In millions of dollars)

	Revised 302(b) suballocations as of June 8, 2000 (H. Rpt. 106-660)		Current level reflecting action completed as of June 15, 2000		Difference	
	BA	O	BA	O		
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	14,491	14,974	42	3,882	(14,449)	(11,092)
Commerce, Justice, State .....	34,904	35,977	283	12,279	(34,621)	(23,698)
National Defense .....	288,414	279,025	0	89,078	(288,414)	(189,947)
District of Columbia .....	414	414	0	36	(414)	(378)
Energy & Water Development .....	21,743	22,025	0	7,908	(21,743)	(14,117)
Foreign Operations .....	13,281	8,512	0	9,859	(13,281)	1,347
Interior .....	14,742	15,322	36	5,399	(14,706)	(9,923)
Labor, HHS & Education .....	97,159	91,156	18,954	64,188	(78,205)	(26,968)
Legislative Branch .....	2,355	2,383	0	352	(2,355)	(2,031)
Military Construction .....	8,634	8,684	0	6,101	(8,634)	(2,583)
Transportation <sup>1</sup> .....	14,989	48,513	20	28,651	(14,969)	(19,862)
Treasury-Postal Service .....	14,088	14,563	62	3,202	(14,026)	(11,361)
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies .....	76,194	84,154	3,561	47,808	(72,633)	(36,346)
Reserve/Offsets .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unassigned .....	273	273	0	768	(273)	495
Grand Total .....	601,681	625,975	22,958	279,511	(578,723)	(346,464)

<sup>1</sup> Transportation does not include mass transit BA.

## COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SEC. 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET &amp; EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

(Dollars in millions)

	Defense <sup>1</sup>		Nondefense <sup>1</sup>		General purpose		Highway category		Mass transit category	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Statutory Caps <sup>2</sup> .....	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	541,095	547,279	0	26,920	( <sup>3</sup> )	4,639
Current Level .....	0	99,470	22,958	156,530	22,958	256,000	0	18,968	0	4,543
Difference (Current Level—Caps) .....	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	-518,137	-291,279	( <sup>3</sup> )	-7,952	( <sup>3</sup> )	-96

<sup>1</sup> Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.<sup>2</sup> Established by OMB Budget Enforcement Act Preview Report.<sup>3</sup> Not applicable.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, June 19, 2000.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2001 budget and is current through June 15, 2000. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the

technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements, disability reviews, and adoption assistance. These revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. This is my first letter for fiscal year 2001.

Since the beginning of the second session of the 106th Congress, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed an act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (P.L.

106-17), the Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176), the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181), the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-185), and the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200). In addition, the Congress cleared for the President's signature the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559).

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE  
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

## FISCAL YEAR 2001 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 15, 2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget (authority)	Outlays	Revenues	Surplus
Enacted in previous sessions:				
Revenues .....	0	0	1,514,800	.....
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	961,064	916,715	0	.....
Appropriation legislation <sup>1</sup> .....	0	266,010	0	.....
Offsetting receipts .....	-297,807	-297,807	0	.....
Total, previously enacted .....	663,257	884,918	1,514,800	n.a.
Enacted this session: An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (P.L. 106-171)	1	1	0	.....
Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176) .....	8	6	0	.....
Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment & Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181) .....	3,200	0	-2	.....
Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-185) .....	-114	-75	-115	.....
Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200) .....	-47	-47	-442	.....
Total, enacted this session .....	3,048	-115	-559	n.a.
Cleared pending signature:				
Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559) .....	3,060	2,165	0	n.a.
Entitlements and Mandatories:				
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	283,602	262,778	0	n.a.
Total Current Level <sup>1</sup> .....	952,967	1,149,381	1,514,241	364,860
Total Budget Resolution .....	1,529,886	1,495,196	1,503,200	8,004
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	0	0	11,041	356,856
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	-576,919	-345,815	0	0
Memorandum:				
Revenues, 2001-2005:				
House Current Level .....	0	0	8,169,171	n.a.
House Budget Resolution .....	0	0	8,022,400	n.a.
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	0	0	146,771	n.a.
2001 Advances:				
FY 2002 House Current Level .....	0	0	0	n.a.
FY 2001 House Budget Resolution .....	0	0	23,500	n.a.
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	0	0	-23,500	n.a.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include budget authority or outlays for Social Security administrative expenses. As a result, current level excludes these items.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.  
Notes.—P.L.=Public Law; n.a.=not applicable.

# OPPOSE H.R. 4717

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Values Action Team, I rise to bring to the Members' attention the strong opposition of many of the outside pro-family groups to the Archer-Houghton disclosure bill, H.R. 4717.

Since this bill has been broadened to include, not only 527s, but now 501(c)(4)s, (c)(5)s, (c)(6)s, and it is being marketed as a disclosure bill, the provision would result in such burdensome regulations that many of these organizations feel they would be out of business as far as issue advocacy and representing their constituencies in lobbying.

I submit for the RECORD about 30 letters from 30 organizations, including the Family Research Council, Eagle Forum, Christian Coalition, National Right to Life, Concerned Women for America, American Conservative Union, Traditional Values Coalition, U.S. Business and Industry Council, Citizens Against Government Waste, and many others, and trust that Members will take this into consideration.

The letters are as follows:

NATIONAL RIGHT TO  
LIFE COMMITTEE, INC.,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 2000.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are writing to express the strong objections of the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) to the punitive and unconstitutional legislation approved yesterday by the Ways & Means Committee, which is expected to come before the full House during the week of June 26.

NRLC, Inc. and its state affiliates are 501(c)(4) corporations. These organizations have non-profit status simply because they exist not to make a profit but to promote a cause—the protection of innocent human life. Contributions to 501(c)(4) corporations are not tax-deductible.

HR 4717 is being marketed as merely requiring "disclosure" by organizations, including 501(c)(4) corporations, that engage in so-called "political activities." But in fact it would impose extremely burdensome regulations on the day-to-day advocacy and grassroots lobbying activities of many long-established and respectable membership organizations, including NRLC and NRLC's state affiliates. The bill would required groups such as NRLC and NRLC affiliates to file reports with the IRS giving a "detailed description," including "the purpose and intended results," of communications to our members or to members of the public merely because those communications mention the name of a member of Congress, or Vice-president Gore or some other "candidate." (Under current federal law, the term "candidate" includes every member of Congress who has not announced his retirement, including each senator throughout his six-year term.)

These requirements are triggered by an expenditure of as little as \$1,000 on any such activity. This requirement would apply, among other things, to routine grassroots alerts regarding upcoming legislative

events—whether disseminated by mail, telephone, paid ads, e-mail alert systems, or websites.

Incredibly, these requirements would apply even to communications to our own members that mention the name of a member of Congress or other federal politician, if the communication "urges such members to communicate with another person or to take an action as a result of such communication." Thus, an "action alert" in the National Right to Life News, urging our members to write "letters to the editor" of local newspapers expressing support for the "Hyde Amendment," would need to be reported to the IRS. Indeed, if a group spent \$1,000 on a mailing to urge its members to "pray for the defeat of the Kennedy bill," that group would be required to give a "detailed description" of that activity to the IRS, including a listing of "the candidates intended to be affected."

In addition, the bill would unconstitutionally require that our organizations report to the government—and place in the public domain—the name, address, occupation, and employer of any person who contributes \$1,000 per year or more to our organizations. Stripping our best donors of privacy in this manner will expose them to harassment and exploitation by fly-by-night telemarketers and other outside parties. It would also expose them to retribution from employers or pro-abortion activists who do not agree with their support for the right-to-life cause. This is not a hypothetical concern—pro-abortion activists have in the past used boycotts and other means to "punish" businessmen and others who support pro-life causes.

Respectfully, we do not believe that the Constitution permits our elected representatives to demand that groups of citizens, organized to promote a cause, must report to government bureaucrats every instance in which they dare to utter the name of a federal politician to multiple listeners. The Constitution protects the rights of our members to associate, to express opinions on the actions of federal politicians, and to urge other citizens to communicate with their elected representatives, without being subjected to intrusive oversight by politicians, political appointees, or federal bureaucrats.

Finally, it is worth noting that the burdens imposed by HR 4717 would not apply to the largest organizational sponsor of pro-abortion lobbying and issue advocacy—the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA). That is because PPFA is 501(c)(3) organization, which are not covered by the bill. Private donors to PPFA obtain tax deductions, unlike donors to NRLC. Yet, because PPFA files under the special 501(h) category, PPFA can and does engage extensively in mass communications that mention the names of members of Congress (issue advocacy), including grassroots lobbying campaigns aimed at Congress. Inclusion of 501(h) organizations would not make the bill constitutional, but the exclusion of PPFA makes the bill even more outrageous.

We strongly urge you to oppose this legislation. We intend to inform our members and donors regarding how members of the House vote regarding protection of their rights to privacy and their ability to collectively petition their elected representatives.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. O'STEEN, PH.D.,  
Executive Director.  
DOUGLAS JOHNSON,

Legislative Director.

CHRISTIAN COALITION,  
Chesapeake, VA, June 26, 2000.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I am writing to you about one of the most important votes for the Christian Coalition membership that you may ever cast in your career—that is the upcoming vote on campaign finance reform. The Christian Coalition strongly opposes H.R. 4717, the "Full and Fair Political Activity Disclosure Act," because of the impact it would have on the Christian Coalition as an organization by forcing us to publicly disclose the names of our donors, and because of its intrusive and burdensome reporting requirements. H.R. 4717 is a blatant violation of our constitutional right to free speech and to freedom of association. Be assured that the Christian Coalition intends to publicize to our supporters in the clearest possible terms how you vote on H.R. 4717, and the impact of your vote on the Christian Coalition.

H.R. 4717 would require the Christian Coalition and many of our affiliates to publicly report the name, address, occupation, and employer of any contributors who contribute an aggregate of \$1,000 or more during the reporting period. Freedom of speech and freedom of association are two of the most fundamental rights acknowledged by the U.S. Constitution. The freedom to donate money to support controversial or unpopular views is crucial to both these rights. Activists committed to social change will never be able to lead the rest of us to a better life without the financial support of generous souls willing to sacrifice their hard earned capital as an investment for the future. H.R. 4717 would punish individuals who support political action on controversial issues. Opposition activists could target contributors for harassment, both legal and illegal. What would have happened to the Civil Rights movement of the 1950's and 60's if the KKK had access to the donor lists for the NAACP and the ACLU? Americans must never be forced to risk their jobs, their homes, their friends, or their lives merely because they choose to contribute money for causes that others may not yet understand.

The United States Supreme Court has recognized that the public disclosure of donors has "the practical effect of discouraging the exercise of constitutionally protected political rights," *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 65 (1976), since "revelation of the identity of rank-and-file members expose[s] these members to economic reprisal, loss of employment, threat of physical coercion and other manifestations of public hostility." *NAACP v. Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449, 462 (1958). In light of the controversial issues that the Christian Coalition has been willing to stand and fight for over the years, the public reporting of our donor base could cripple the Christian Coalition as our donations dry up.

H.R. 4717 would also require the Christian Coalition to file quarterly reports of any communications over \$1,000 that involve the name or likeness of a candidate, or which meet the IRS definition of political intervention—an extremely vague and nebulous definition. But the bill goes even further and goes so far as to force disclosure of the money spent for internal communications from an organization's officers to its general membership regarding elected officials if the communication calls for the membership to take action. Even legislative alerts and

other communications to our membership regarding pending legislation would need to be reported to the government if they exceed the \$1,000 threshold. We reject the notion that Congress can require grassroots citizen organizations like the Christian Coalition that are organized to promote a cause, to constantly report to the government our internal communications with our membership regarding pending legislation would need to be reported to the government if they exceed the \$1,000 threshold. We reject the notion that Congress can require grassroots citizen organizations like the Christian Coalition that are organized to promote a cause, to constantly report to the government our internal communications with our membership, or our communications with the public merely because they mention the name of a candidate, and be subjected to intrusive oversight by political appointees and other government employees.

It is particularly offensive that H.R. 4717 applies to groups like the Christian Coalition, but not to the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, a 501(c)3 organization that is the largest organizational sponsor of pro-abortion lobbying.

On behalf of the members and supporters of the Christian Coalition, I urge you to stand up for the rights of our membership and vote against H.R. 4717.

Sincerely,

SUSAN T. MUSKETT,  
*Director, Legislative Affairs.*  
EAGLE FORUM,  
June 23, 2000.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT, MAJORITY LEADER ARMY, AND MAJORITY WHIP DELAY: On behalf of Eagle Forum members nationwide, I am writing in strong opposition to the Full and Fair Political Activity Disclosure Act of 2000 (H.R. 4717), which was approved by the Ways and Means Committee yesterday. This bill gives the federal government the authority to police the activities of section 527, 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), and section 501(c)(6) organizations.

Eagle Forum functions as a 501(c)(4) tax-exempt organization and does not receive tax-deductible contributions. While H.R. 4717 is being marketed as a "disclosure" bill, implementing its provisions would result in burdensome paperwork that would take a heavy toll on our day-to-day activities and grassroots lobbying. Once Eagle Forum spends \$10,000 on legislative activities that merely mention the name of a Member of Congress or a candidate, we would be required to file reports with the Internal Revenue Service giving a "detailed description . . . including the purpose and intended results" of our communications. We do not want the IRS knocking on our door every time we send an alert, conduct a postcard campaign, or generate phone calls.

It is Eagle Forum's policy to respect and protect the privacy of our members. Therefore, we do not rent or share our lists. However, H.R. 4717 would force us to report to the government, thereby placing in the public domain, the name, address, occupation, and employer of any person who contributes \$1,000 or more in one year to Eagle Forum. This requirement would force our members into the public sphere despite our long-standing policy of protecting our members' privacy, which is guaranteed by the First Amendment, see *NAACP v. Patterson*, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Finally, our system of government relies on citizen participation. The U.S. Constitution does not give federal government the authority to police or force organizations,

such as Eagle Forum, to report to government bureaucrats. Freedom of speech and association are fundamental principles. Yet, H.R. 4717 replaces these freedoms with intrusive government oversight.

I urge you to pull the bill from the legislative calendar. If this bill in fact reaches the floor, I encourage you to oppose it. Eagle Forum members in your district will be waiting to hear our report on how you voted.

Faithfully,

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY,  
*President.*

FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL,  
Washington DC, June 26, 2000.

Re: HR 4717, "Exempt Organization Political Activity Disclosure Act of 2000"

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Family Research Council urges you in the strongest possible terms to vote "NO" on the "Exempt Organization Political Activity Disclosure Act of 2000" (H.R. 4417) and the Doggett substitute. These measures would unconstitutionally restrict First Amendment freedom of speech rights and permit the government to intrude egregiously on the privacy of millions of Americans. The measures also would impose an undue burden on the constitutional right to petition government for the grievances and unnecessarily limit freedom of association.

Requiring non-profit organizations to report all contributions in excess of \$1,000 would needlessly expose donors to possible harassment, reprisals and public abuse. The U.S. Supreme Court already has ruled that non-profit donor confidentiality is constitutional and an important privacy protection for those who wish to exercise their constitutional rights by expressing their opinions on matters of public policy. Two weeks ago, a federal appeals court struck down a Vermont law that sought to force disclosure by groups that sponsor issue ads. "The constitutional defects are particularly serious because of their impact on anonymous communications, which have played a central role in the development of free expression and democratic governance," the appeals court said.

Information regarding donors, moreover, is proprietary. Making such information public through government agencies would allow competing groups, unscrupulous hucksters or other outside parties to target an organization's supporters.

Extending donor reporting requirements to non-profit organizations is unneeded. Such organizations already are "explicitly barred from having a primarily electoral purpose." H.R. 4417 has nothing to do with "campaign finance." It would, however, subject non-profit organizations to unwarranted government scrutiny when they are engaged in good faith, lawful public policy advocacy. This requirement would have a profound chilling effect on public policy debate and almost all grassroots issues advocacy.

H.R. 4417 would inappropriately cede too much power to the IRS to scrutinize the daily activities of issue advocacy groups. The bill would not only require the reporting of gifts and contributions to non-profit organizations, but would compel them to disclose the "purpose and intended results" of such donations. This would drive the IRS into the mind-reading business. The potential here for abuses of power or manipulation of the tax-collecting agency for political purposes is painfully self-evident. H.R. 4417 effectively would empower the government to control and limit public debate on policy issues or pending legislation. This would be fatal to participatory democracy.

Our nation's founders neither intended nor imagined that one day American citizens would be required to subject themselves to the dictates of the government, federal bureaucrats or political appointees, or be required to obtain permission simply to exercise their unalienable rights. The Constitution protects the rights of the American people to freely associate, to petition their elected representatives and express their opinions individually or collectively without intrusive oversight by the government.

The Family Research Council strongly urges you to oppose the misguided provisions contained in H.R. 4417 and the Doggett substitute.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. DONOVAN,  
*Executive Vice President.*

CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2000.

Hon. JOE PITTS,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS, Concerned Women for America (CWA) is writing to express our firm opposition to the Houghton 527 amendment. This amendment *threatens the future of "issue advocacy"* for many non-profit public policy groups.

This measure is over-broad and attempts to solve a perceived problem with one type of organization by targeting even 501(c)(4) non-profit educational groups. Reporting their donors is wholly unwarranted and a violation of the donor's right of association.

Furthermore, the IRS definition of "political activity" is vague and may change in the future. Organizations which in good faith attempt law-abiding efforts to further their public policy agenda could be held hostage by the IRS and this legislation.

This measure has been hastily drawn and it shows. Therefore, the over 500,000 members of Concerned Women for America urge the House of Representatives and House leadership to oppose the Houghton 527 amendment.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY LAHAYE,  
*Chairman and Founder.*

June 23, 2000.

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: A vote on a bill sponsored by Representative Amo Houghton (R-NY) in regard to disclosure of tax-exempt group's political activities is scheduled to take place prior to the Congressional July 4th recess. This vote should be postponed.

The signers of this letter are gravely concerned that this important issue is being treated with undue haste. Hasty, ill-considered legislation may not only fail to address the problem this legislation purports to solve, but may also broadly impact all public policy organizations.

The current version of the "Exempt Organization Political Activity Disclosure Act of 2000" suffers from several drafting problems. The legislation includes language which would require the Internal Revenue Service to hire mind readers to conduct audits by establishing an intent standard (e.g. page 2, lines 12 & 13: "The intended results for the major categories of expenditures").

Exactly how the IRS will verify compliance with the reporting requirements this legislation imposes on all law-abiding 501(c)(4) organizations also merits scrutiny. Will an organization's entire computer membership file be turned over to the IRS during an audit in order to allow the IRS computers

to search for undisclosed donors? The security of this information, which is the lifeblood of any organization, may well be compromised if accessed by persons opposed to the organization's beliefs.

This chilling effect of membership disclosure on Constitutionally-protected activity has been addressed by the Supreme Court in *NAACP v. Alabama* 78 S. Ct. 1163 (1958): "It is hardly a novel perception that compelled disclosure of affiliation with groups engaged in advocacy may constitute a(n) effective restraint on freedom of association."

Please postpone consideration of the "Exempt Organization Political Activity Disclosure Act of 2000" until affected organizations and concerned Members of Congress can properly and fully evaluate the scope and impact of this legislation.

(Titles and organizations of signers listed for identification purposes only)

Paul Weyrich, National Chairman, Coalitions for America; Beverly LaHaye, Founder and Chairman, Concerned Women for America; David Keene, Chairman, American Conservative Union; Larry Pratt, Executive Director, Gun Owners of America; Rev. Lou Sheldon, Chairman, Traditional Values Coalition; Gordon S. Jones, President, Association of Concerned Taxpayers; Joe Glover, President, Family Policy Network; Ronald W. Pearson, Executive Director, Conservative Victory Fund; Kent Snyder, Executive Director, Liberty Study Committee; Joe Douglas, Director, Redwood Institute; Dr. Emilio-Adolpho Rivera, Popular Republican Party of Cuba; Tom DeWeese, President, American Policy Center; David N. O'Steen, Ph.D., Executive Director, National Right to Life Committee; Tom Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Kevin L. Kearns, President, U.S. Business and Industry Council; Linda Chavez, President, One Nation Indivisible; Jennifer Bingham, Executive Director, Susan B. Anthony List; C. Preston Noell, III, President, Tradition, Family, Property, Inc.; Jim Boulet, Jr., Executive Director, English First; Laszlo Pasztor, Honorary Chairman, National Republican Heritage Groups Council; Juraj Slavik, Washington Representative, Czechoslovak National Council of America; Jack Clayton, Washington Representative, Public Advocate; Joan Hueter, American Council for Immigration Reform; Wes Vernon, Writer & Broadcaster.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0329

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-704) on the resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4680, MEDICARE RX 2000 ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-705) on the resolution (H. Res. 539) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4680) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARKEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1309. An act to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the preemption of State law in certain cases relating to certain church plans.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

The Committee on House Administration reports that on June 27, 2000 they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 642. To redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the "Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building".

H.R. 643. To redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 2460. To designate the United States Post Office located at 125 Border Avenue West in Wiggins, Mississippi, as the "Jay Hanna 'Dizzy' Dean Post Office".

H.R. 2357. To designate the United States Post Office located at 3675 Warrensville Center Road in Shaker Heights, Ohio, as the "Louise Stokes Post Office".

H.R. 2307. To designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 5 Cedar Street in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas J. Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 1666. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2591. To designate the United States Post Office located at 713 Elm Street in Wakefield, Kansas, as the "William H. Avery Post Office".

H.R. 2952. To redesignate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 100 Orchard Park Drive in Greenville, South Carolina, as the "Keith D. Oglesby Station".

H.R. 3018. To designate certain facilities of the United States Postal Service in South Carolina.

H.R. 3699. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building".

H.R. 3701. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building".

H.R. 3903. To deem the vessel M/V MIST COVE to be less than 100 gross tons, as measured under chapter 145 of title 46, United States Code.

H.R. 4241. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the "Les Aspin Post Office Building".

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 28, 2000, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8373. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,